## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

Ronald L. Fox,

Plaintiff, Case No. 14-11560

v. Judith E. Levy
United States District Judge
Bay City, et al.,

Defendants.

## OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS TO APPEAL [46, 47, 48]

Pro se Plaintiff Ronald L. Fox commenced this civil action in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan on March 11, 2014, and it was transferred to the Eastern District of Michigan on April 18, 2014. (ECF No. 1; ECF No. 18, PageID.185–186.) Plaintiff's complaint challenged "two state-court convictions, one in April of 2004 and one in May of 2005." (ECF No. 18, PageID.185.)

The case was dismissed on September 16, 2014. (ECF No. 18.)
Plaintiff's claims against all Defendants except Bob Panzer were
dismissed with prejudice because Plaintiff was attempting to relitigate

the exact same claims he raised in a prior dismissed case, *Fox v. Bay City*, No. 05-73510 (E.D. Mich.). (ECF No. 18, PageID.190.) His claim against Bob Panzer was dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff did not provide the Court with a current address for Panzer. (*Id.*)

On November 25, 2014, Plaintiff submitted a motion to re-open the case. (ECF No. 20.) In that motion, Plaintiff appears to address his 1997 state conviction, not his 2004 or 2005 convictions. (*Id.*) The Court denied this motion because a state conviction and sentence cannot be challenged through a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 21, PageID.203.)

In January 2025, Plaintiff filed an additional three motions. (ECF No. 36, 37, 38.) Plaintiff appeared to move for default judgment to be set aside, and challenged the validity of his 1997 state criminal conviction for 4th Degree Attempted Criminal Sexual Conduct. (See ECF No. 41.) The Court denied the motions. (Id.)

Before the Court are Plaintiff's three motions to appeal. (ECF Nos. 46, 47, 48.) In two of the motions, Plaintiff attaches a copy of the dismissal order in this case. (ECF No. 46, PageID.258; ECF No. 47, PageID.264.) Plaintiff also states that he "file[s] this appeal." (ECF No. 46, PageID.257;

ECF No. 47, PageID.262; see ECF No. 48, PageID.268 ("Plaintiff, Ron Fox, appealed to the Supreme Court.").)

It is not clear to the Court what relief Plaintiff seeks in these motions. To the extent Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the September 16, 2014 order dismissing this case (ECF No. 18), the motion is denied for the reasons set forth in previous orders. (ECF Nos. 18, 19.)

If Plaintiff is requesting to extend or reopen the time to appeal the dismissal of this case, Plaintiff's motion is denied. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(5)(A) states, "[t]he district court may extend the time to file a notice of appeal if[] a party so moves no later than 30 days after [the time to appeal] expires" and if the "party shows excusable neglect or good cause." Here, the time to file a notice of appeal expired years ago. Additionally, Plaintiff has not shown excusable neglect or good cause.

Also, Plaintiff does not fulfill the requirements set forth in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(6), which permits the Court to "reopen the time to file an appeal for a period of 14 days." Plaintiff received notice of the order dismissing his case, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6)(A), and the

motions to appeal were filed over 180 days after that order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6)(B), which was entered on September 16, 2024.

For the reasons set forth above, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motions to appeal. (ECF Nos. 46, 47, 48.) This case remains closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 1, 2025 Ann Arbor, Michigan s/Judith E. Levy JUDITH E. LEVY United States District Judge

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or first-class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on May 1, 2025.

s/William Barkholz WILLIAM BARKHOLZ Case Manager